

## MINUTES

### **Technical Committee Meeting**

Thursday, August 17, 2006

1:30 p.m.

Conference Room #113

**Members Present:** Karl Fredrickson, Larry Worth, Randy Hoskins, Virendra Singh, Public Works/Utilities; Marc Wullschleger, Urban Development; Marvin Krout, David Cary, Planning; Randy Peters, Ron Schlautman (representing Steve McBeth), NDOR; Rick Thoreson, Health Department; and Doug Pillard, County Engineering

**Others Present:** Steve Burnham, FHWA; Mike Brienzo, Roger Ohlrich, Brian Praeuner, Scott Cockrill and Karen Sieckmeyer, Public Works/Utilities; Kent Morgan, Planning; Dawn Steffen, Brian Ray, HWS Consulting Group; Gary Bergstrom, Health Department; and K. McClelland, NDOR

---

Karl Fredrickson called the meeting to order and roll-call was taken.

#### **Agenda Item No. 1 - Review and action on the draft minutes of the July 20, 2006, Technical Committee Meeting.**

There being no corrections, Marc Wullschleger made a motion to approve the minutes. Larry Worth seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

#### **Agenda Item No. 2 - Review and action on the *2030 Lincoln-Lancaster Long Range Transportation Planning activities*. Actions and comments will be forwarded to the Lincoln/Lancaster Planning Commission for use in developing the *City of Lincoln and Lancaster County 2030 Comprehensive Plan*.**

Randy Hoskins mentioned that the committee should have received two sections. The thinner one is the existing conditions and the thicker one is the future conditions. Hoskins stated that there are not allot of changes but primarily just updating the 2002 version to the 2006 version. It does mention the Transit Development Study which is currently underway for StarTran.

Hoskins then pointed out some of the future conditions.

**Page 3** - Investigate and secure additional revenue resources to implement the proposed the transportation system. Lack of road funding is well documented.

**Page 4** - Removed the old federal requirements and inserted the new SAFETEA-LU information including the new emphasis on safety and security with transportation systems.

**Page 6** - In the past, multi-use trails were primarily found in the bicycle section. However, the City

wanted to talk about the use of those trails by pedestrians, so that is an addition throughout this section. A section was also added on the Pedestrian Facilities Plan for ADA compliance.

**Page 7** - Added text for land uses for pedestrian activity.

**Page 9** - Bicycles should be design users considering new roads.

**Page 10** - Providing bicyclist access to all destinations, so some language was added on bike racks.

**Page 11** - More information on bike racks.

**Pages 13 and 14** - Public transportation section talks extensively about the Transportation Development Plan that Planning and Public Works/Utilities are currently undertaking. Most of what is in here will probably be dependent upon the results of that study. Some point in the future, these documents will be amended or included by reference. Top of page 13, talked more about Intelligent Transportation uses that StarTran is working on like the automatic vehicle locations and smart card Fare-box technology.

**Page 15** - Changes in the parking in the downtown area presently and what might happen in the future. Looked at occupancy levels in garages and perhaps using parking fees as a way of monitoring or moving demand around to different garages.

**Page 16** - Would like to put more emphasis on controlling and managing access.

**Page 18** - Under collector street, Planning and Public Works/Utilities have been having discussions about collector streets and what they see as the role in each of them. The Planning Commission, yesterday, tried to vote in a statement that they wanted to see added which talked about one continuous north-south; one east-west collector street in every square mile.

**Page 20** - The two plus center turn lane program. The Planning Commission wanted to add some additional language about established neighborhoods in addition to the build environment.

**Page 24** - Planning Commission had a detailed discussion about the area near the north end of North 48<sup>th</sup> Street, Fremont to Greenwood Street. This discussion focused on whether this area should be widened since there are homes that front North 48<sup>th</sup> Street. The Planning Commission voted in agreement that this should be a 4 +1 facility. However, they did add language stating they realize there is housing on both sides but the widening does need to be done.

**Page 27** - The City will be installing grade separations along the Highway 2 Corridor.

**Page 28 and 29** - Additional information on RUTS was added. Doug Pillard asked, if, at some point, will the future road improvements in the county be included on a map? Hoskins said what they will be doing is combining all the information into one map or expanding to two maps. One of the problems that the City had with the old right-of-way maps, was some of the streets were on the City map and some on the County and you had to look at both of them to figure it out. The City will certainly have all of the streets in close to the City on the City map for ease of identifying them. What they would like is to have an single map with the full county on it. Pillard said one of their concerns is within the three mile limit. We have had discussions on the RUTS program under County Road System and the County road improvements in the three mile limit. Pillard asked if the County is bound by the City improvements that are shown with in the three mile limit? Fredrickson said that RUTS should cover the three mile area but

will need to address the phasing issue on how many lanes over time. If the right-of-way is there, the initial construction may be phased based on that agreement and then as the city grows per the RUTS program then the City would be annexed in and add the additional lane.

**Page 29** - Updated the numbers and noted that we are looking for gas and sales tax increases that are not yet indicated as a funding sources.

**Page 31** - Planning Commission asked that we clarify under number six the New Funds noted which are a ½ cent City sales tax and State gasoline tax.

**Page 32** - The Intelligent Transportation System has been totally rewritten.

**Page 35** -The City took into account the new federal legislation and its emphasis on long term management so there is quite a bit of text change there.

**Page 36** - The City is looking more differently at streets that are in the built environment versus the outside and using criteria to assess the improvements.

**Page 37** - Talking about the ITS technology that the City is using to help looking at traffic.

**Page 39** - This has been updated to remove what projects have been completed and add some new ones. One of the things that the Planning Commission asked is that in the last paragraph in railroads, talking about the potential to relocate the railroad tracks along Highway 2. The railroad also wanted us to explore the potential of a light rail corridor.

**Page 40** - There are a number of access issues here that are important that were included.

**Page 42** - The City added a page on inter-modal and multi-modal freight operations.

Krout asked if we needed to take action today? Hoskins thought this was just a briefing and for the Technical Committee to see the text. Virendra Singh said they would be incorporating the changes from the Planning Commission as directed.

Steve Burnham mentioned that he had been gone for two weeks. When he returned on Sunday, he read the paper and in the paper there is a statement that says “it is fine for the public to talk about widening streets but the transportation plan update is not intended to revisit policies developed by the task force”. Burnham stated that statement is 180 degrees out of phase with planning requirements. The purpose of a transportation plan update is to revisit anything older than five years. For any transportation option, or for any discussion on transportation options to be preempted or foreclosed is unacceptable. The well has now been poisoned with the acceptability of this plan. Burnham doesn’t know what measures are going to be taken to render it acceptable but extraordinary measures will have to be taken. Burnham doesn’t think the FHWA will be in a position to dictate to the City what will be acceptable. He does know that he was called in Monday morning to the Division Administrator’s Office and he expressed his dismay on this very same statement so it was not just Burnham. What Burnham expects to see is public discourse on transportation options and if one has been pre-emptedly foreclosed, then it must specifically be publicly discussed to a greater length than it might have before. Burnham doesn’t want to be misunderstood, it is perfectly acceptable for the issues to be discussed and for Lincoln to decide not to widen streets for exactly the reasons given. That is acceptable, but the preempted foreclosure of the discussion is not acceptable. Marvin Krout stated that just because of one council member’s

statement does not mean that is the way it was processed. It doesn't mean that there wasn't some internal discussion about options, and Krout is not sure how far you are saying that a community must go in exploring options in order to satisfy federal requirements. Burnham said a community is not required necessarily to any specific lengths to discuss any specific option. They are not going to make you study heavy rail, etc. even though that is an option. But, for the benefit of the community to say it is beyond the scope of discussion to even discuss heavy rail, for example, makes the process unacceptable. Krout stated that the fact that he made a statement about how he feels, how does that poison the process? Burnham stated that it preempts the public discussion on that issue. Krout said, because it intimidates someone from the public coming to us in September or October? Burnham mentioned that the public has already been put on notice that it has already been decided and it is not even going to be discussed in the transportation plan update. Krout asked how do we control what any elective official is going to say? Do we tell the City Council that they shouldn't make any comments about the transportation plan until it gets to them? This is a legislative issue; its an election season; and City Council members are likely to say all kinds of things. Burnham understands what Krout is saying, but preempting public discourse on any transportation option is unacceptable. Wullschleger asked Burnham what would happen if we didn't do this. Burnham said they would have to decide if the transportation plan is acceptable or not. If not, you will get no federal funding which amounts to \$377 million dollars over the life of the plan. Randy Peters stated that he hoped the appropriate body of the Technical Committee or the City Council could prepare a clarification that individuals quoted in the paper didn't represent a quorum and represent a different official view point; these statements did not intend to preempt the public discussion; and then site the different public forums that have taken place and those that are scheduled to take place and make the case that it wasn't preempted.

Discussion was held regarding the fact that the model doesn't get updated when there is an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan. Ron Schlautman feels it is restrictive, say for the next five years, there will be several amendments but the model will stay put and really it is outdated every time an amendment is made to the Comprehensive Plan. Lincoln amends their Comprehensive Plan quite often but never has the model been updated or modify to reflect the new changes. Mike Brienzo stated that the Comprehensive Plan is updated every five years; and there are different ways of using the model. 1) It is used system wide; 2) for sub-area analysis and creating sub-area plans; and 3) other focus area planning activities or specific sight level development within the City. Virendra Singh said that the model that is in front of us, and Schlautman has been involved in this process, takes you to the land use that Mike Piernicky discussed. It is the City's role to look at the land use information and the possible changes that will be coming forward within the next year or two and use this to take another look at the model. What kind of impacts is that land-use going to create on some of the roadways. Then come back and recommend if there should be some different improvements or some other way to handle the traffic that is going to be generated by those values. Singh said they are keeping that option open. That is something that the City has stated from the very beginning. The City wanted something that would be more flexible.

Randy Peters mentioned that last fall in Ithaca, the Department of Roads had promoted a safety conscious planning effort so that you could identify some highway injury reduction goals and try to incorporate some strategic thinking into your Long Range Plan. With three MPO's in the state, we want to target the MPO's to lead in planning on the safety agreement. As Peters looks through the Long Range Transportation Plan, the safety issues are fragmented. There are safe walks to school in the pedestrian area but there is no talk about any goals for reducing fatalities any strategic things outside of infrastructure like automated enforcement. He knows that Lincoln is very progressive on this but he is just suggesting that you organize a section on safety as a place marker.

Hoskins stated that the Planning Commission will continue to work on the text not only for the Long Term Transportation Plan but for the whole Comprehensive Plan. In September, the draft is scheduled to be released around the 21<sup>st</sup> of September. The City is looking at having open houses with the public on the 27<sup>th</sup> and 28<sup>th</sup> of September to get this out to the public. The Planning Commission will be acting on the entire Comprehensive Plan including the Long Range Transportation Plan in October. In November, the City will be taking it to City Council and County Board.

**Agenda Item No. 3. - Review of the “preliminary” system level Air Quality Impact Analysis evaluating the Planning Commission Recommended Alternative Roadway Network (12a). This analysis is based upon U.S. EPA computer model “Mobile 6.2” model runs which is used to perfect roadway related emissions and toxics from motor vehicles.**

Rick Thoreson stated that this is a preliminary analysis of a system wide air quality impact report. Brienzo, from Engineering Services, had asked if they could help look into modeling activities and look at projects at future vehicle volumes. Thoreson wanted to point out a few things. The National Air Quality Standards are health risk standards established to look for hot spots and areas in the country that could be issues for health reasons. The Health Department determined if they are in compliance with those standards through air quality monitoring. Here in Lincoln there are several monitors in place that run 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. One of the monitors is carbon monoxide and it is located at 27<sup>th</sup> and O Street; an ozone monitor is location in the Village of Davey since we have southerly winds predominately in the summer time, the monitor is placed north of Lincoln to determine what the levels or concentrations of ozone level are. The Health Department has purchased the software package that allows them to quickly use EPA Mobil 6 model. It is a very complicated model and the software that is being used now greatly simplifies the process and makes it much less labor intensive. It looks at several pollutants including carbon monoxide (CO), volatile organic compounds (VOCs), as well as nitrogen oxides (NOx). It also looks at sulfur dioxide and hazardous air pollutants.

The model provides us with emissions factors for various vehicle classes or various speeds. You take those emission factors and multiply them times vehicle miles traveled and then we come up with emissions from several different categories.

The Health Department looked at three different scenarios. 1) The current scenario which is the 2004 Land Use network (calibrated model); 2) 2030 Land Use on 2004 network (no build); and 3) 2030 Land Use on LRTP Alternative Network which is endorsed by the Planning Commission. The tables on Page 3 clearly show the numbers that were reached as they ran the model. There are several different pollutants VOC, CO, and NOx are the ones that the Health Department is most interested in for transportation related planning. Thoreson asked everyone to turn to Page 4 with the three scenarios. You can see that there is approximately a 75 percent increase from the current situation and the 2030 alternative network systems. Figure B illustrates the NOx emissions and, in this case, comparing the current situation with the 2030 alternative, we have approximately a 90 - 95 percent increase. Figure C, on page 5, illustrates CO and there is approximately an 80 percent increase between the current and future alternative networks. Figures D, E, and F simply illustrate the 10 different functional classes and the emissions from those. There are many other sources that contribute to our pollution picture. When you are trying to determine the impact of mobile sources emissions, you have to remember that it is only part of the picture. Some other sources would include industrial complexes, institutional facilities that have large boilers that create CO, VOC, and NOx. There is a large coal burning power plant in Hallam. Other transportation related sources are railway network, the airport, off-road vehicles, construction equipment, agriculture equipment, lawn mowers, weed wackers, and snow blowers. All of these contribute to our overall picture and all of that is monitored when the Health Department measures the

concentrations in the air so it is important that we understand that cars and trucks aren't the only source of air pollution. Currently, their monitoring indicates that we are at about 20 percent of the standard. In other words, our total concentrations are well below the National Ambient Air Quality Standard for CO. Ozone is a little different. The criteria for determining compliance is based on statistical procedure. You take the fourth highest 8 hour reading in a rolling 12 month period of time. Using that criteria, we are at about 60 to 65 percent of the standard for ozone. In the same breath, if we average our ozone monitoring results, we are quite a bit below the standard again. Given the fact that cars and trucks don't contribute as much to the overall picture as some other sources. Based on their projections, for the future, the Health Department can safely say that we will remain in compliance with the NOx for CO. We foresee a doubling of CO admissions from automobiles and that would probably put us in the category of 30 to 40 percent with the level of the NOx. So we should be well under the standards for CO. We feel that we will be very close to exceeding the ozone standard if we do not take into consideration any advancements in technology and increased use of alternative transportation. If we don't take into consideration use of hybrid vehicles, perhaps by 2030 we will have hydrogen fuel cell vehicles. This is a very preliminary look into this. They will be doing a more detailed analysis, perhaps looking at certain portions of the network. The main message here is that if no other changes take place, we could be close to exceeding the ozone standard by 2030.

**Agenda Item No. 4. - Other topics for discussion.**

With no other items for discussion, the meeting was adjourned.